



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,624	10/28/2003	Ryan Taylor Herbst	00121-002900000	5633
7590 RYAN T. HERBST 735A SAPPHIRE STREET REDWOOD CITY, CA 94061				
03/13/2008				
EXAMINER				
PEUGH, BRIAN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2187				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/696,624

Applicant(s)

HERBST ET AL.

Examiner

Brian R. Peugh

Art Unit

2187

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 55-57 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 55-57 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed February 2, 2008 in response to PTO Office Action dated August 10, 2007. The applicant's remarks and amendment to the specification and/or claims were considered with the results that follow.

Claims 1-17 and 55-57 have been presented for examination in this application. In response to the last Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-17, and 55 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sachedina et al. (US# 2003/0204698).

Regarding claim 55, Sachedina teaches a method comprising: receiving a semaphore operation command (thread) from a network processor through an intra-

system interface that identifies one of a plurality of semaphores in a linked list of active semaphore structures stored in a hash bucket memory [para. 0020] addressable through application of a hash function to a semaphore value associated with the semaphore; updating at least one of the active semaphore structures in the hash bucket memory according to the semaphore operation command received from the network processor through the intrasystem interface; and returning a semaphore operation result to the network processor through an intra-system interface indicating an outcome of the semaphore operation command and responsive to the semaphore operation command received [resize requiring data set changing, para. 0055-0056].

Regarding claim 56, Sachedina et al. teaches delaying the returning operation until after a second semaphore operation command from the network processor has been completed [asynchronous resizing, para. 0056-0057].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachedina et al. (US# 2003/0204698) and Pham (US# 6,535,968).

Sachedina et al. fails to teach the intra-system interface is a zero bus turnaround interface. Pham teaches a ZBT that interfaces said processor to a network processor [server (126)] configured to perform a storage function [Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 29-42 & col. 6, lines 41-46]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Sachedina et al. and Pham before him at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sachedina et al. to include the ZBT system of Pham, because then performance could be improved by eliminating wasted cycles between read and write storage operations [col. 2, lines 38-42].

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-17 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian R. Peugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00am to 4:30pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday's from 7:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks, can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2187

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Brian R. Peugh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2187
March 3, 2008